





# A LETTER

TO THE

Protestants of the United Kingdom,

EXHIBITING THE REAL PRINCIPLES

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS AND PRIESTS

IN IRELAND,

AS CONTAINED IN THEIR STANDARD OF THEOLOGY

ADOPTED IN 1808.

AND

SINCE USED AS A GUIDE IN THEIR PRIVATE

CLERICAL CONFERENCES.

BY THE REV. R. J. M'GHEE.

---

Second Edition, corrected.

---

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY L. AND J. SEELEY, 169 FLEET STREET.

---

1835.

L. AND J. SRELEY, WESTON GREEN, THAMES DITTON.

---

*To the Protestants of the United Kingdom, of all denominations, and especially to the Protestants of Ireland.*

---

DEAR FRIENDS, MEN, AND BRETHREN,

THE following statement of facts will serve to show you the real principles of the Church of Rome, and what prospects of toleration are held out to you, should she regain that *ascendancy* after which her priesthood are striving.

You are aware that of all the difficulties with which we have ever had to contend, in investigating the principles of the Church of Rome, the greatest has been to fasten those principles on any existing individual or individuals. If we brought forward any of the doctrines of intolerance and persecution inculcated by the Canons of their infallible councils, these were got rid of by some evasion, as if they belonged to the temper and spirit of former times, and as if modern Popery had totally abandoned them; if we urged on them the principles of their standard authors which we knew they maintained, we were immediately told these were the opinions of individuals, and that the church was not account-

able for what any individual might write, so that though we knew and felt that the modern Church held the most intolerant principles that ever disgraced the code of ancient superstition, we never have been able to bring the fact home to them; they concealed, evaded, denied, abjured, through every subterfuge of jesuitical policy, till at last the nation has been deluded into the belief that Popery has not only become tolerant, but even liberal; and while invasion of freedom of conscience, and property, and life, has marked their practice, they have been professing in their speeches, and toasting at their public carousals, "THE CAUSE OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY ALL OVER THE WORLD."

But as God in his great mercy revealed the hidden guilt and treachery of former times, when it would have destroyed in one blast the Monarch and the Parliament of England in the horrible Gunpowder Plot, so he has in his great mercy, unexpectedly brought to light the dark and hidden principles of modern times, by which, should occasion offer, we perceive the fate that awaits our liberties, our properties, our religion, and our lives. May God Almighty in his mercy return good for evil, and awaken men at length to see the guilt, and the atrocity of these principles, which as they cannot bear the light even of human investigation, must shrink in condemnation before the bar of a righteous and merciful God.

The facts are shortly these. The Roman Catholic Priests of Ireland, are bound, under the penalty of mortal sin, to recite certain religious exercises, which are called their *offices*, every day; these offices are published annually in a Calendar, or Directory for every day in the year, under the order of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; the title of that published for this year, for example, is as follows; (Translated from the Latin.)



THE ORDER OF RECITING THE DIVINE OFFICE  
AND OF CELEBRATING THE MASS,

FOR THE USE OF THE VENERABLE SECULAR CLERGY OF IRELAND,  
FOR THE YEAR 1835;

ARRANGED BY PATRICK WOODS, PRESBYTER,  
BY THE ORDER OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND MOST REVEREND  
THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN,  
AND TO BE CAREFULLY OBSERVED BY HIS CLERGY.

---

DUBLIN: PRINTED BY RICHARD COYNE,

4, CAPEL STREET,

PRINTER AND BOOKSELLER TO THE ROYAL COLLEGE, ST. PATRICK, MAYNOOTH.

Now the Roman Catholic Priests of Ireland have also four conferences every year, in which they discuss questions arranged for them by their Archbishops and Bishops; the questions of these conferences are also printed annually in these Directories, so that the Priests, who must necessarily be in possession of the Directories for the recitation of their offices, must also of necessity be in possession of those questions to be treated of at their conferences.

But as the Roman Catholic Church does not allow her Priests to speak every man after his own private judgment, but has the regular standard of her infallible councils, according to which those Priests must regulate their opinions: these questions must be treated according to some approved and accredited standard of Romish orthodoxy; and accordingly, if we could authoritatively ascertain what that standard is, and gain possession of that standard, we have then their code of acknowledged and authorized principles, not in the shape of those immense voluminous councils to which we cannot, without great difficulty, refer, but in some clear, accessible, and tangible shape, to which it is easy to have recourse.

Now this great desideratum has been at length obtained, we have at length procured the authoritative standard of the principles of the whole Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, to that we can say, “here are your principles, here are your doctrines, here are your authorized and accredited sentiments on the different topics connected with your religion, so that we can no more be at a loss on the subject, we shall neither run the risk of charging you with principles which you do not hold, nor shall we be blinded or misled by any professions or protestations with which you attempt to deny or conceal those which you really do entertain.”

This information we derive, not from any hearsay evidence but from printed documents—printed under the express authority of all the Roman Catholic Bishops, especially of Dr. Murray, so that we are in no danger of being misled by false information; we have clearly ascertained the fact as you will see by the following document from Mr. Coyne’s Catalogue, printed and sewn up uniformly with the Priest’s Directory, and therefore in the possession necessarily of all the Priests in Ireland under Dr. Murray’s authority.

In this Catalogue for this year, we find the following statement, pages 6 and 7:—

“Just Published,

“DENS’S COMPLETE BODY OF THEOLOGY,

“In 8 vols. 12mo. beautifully printed,

“Price £2. 2s.

“At a meeting of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, assembled in Dublin on the 14th day of September, 1808, they unanimously agreed, that

“DENS’S COMPLETE BODY OF THEOLOGY

“was the best book on the subject that could be republished; as containing the *most secure guidance* for such



“ Ecclesiastics as may, by *reason of the peculiar circum-*  
 “ *stances of this country, be deprived of the opportunity of*  
 “ *referring to public libraries, or consulting those who may*  
 “ *be placed in authority over them ;—*in consequence, an  
 “ edition of the work was ordered to be printed by the  
 “ **PRESENT PUBLISHER**, to the number of 3000  
 “ **COPIES**. The work is now very rare, and scarcely to  
 “ be met with. And inasmuch as his Grace Dr. Murray,  
 “ Dr. Doyle, Dr. Keating, and Dr. Kinsella, have made  
 “ it the Conference Book for the Clergy of the Province  
 “ of Leinster, the Publisher, as well to obviate the difficulty  
 “ experienced by them in procuring the work, as also to  
 “ advance the cause of Religion and Morality in the other  
 “ parts of the Irish Church, is induced to reprint a limited  
 “ number of copies.

“ An additional volume, which is now for the first time  
 “ annexed to the present edition, contains encyclical letters  
 “ of the Sovereign Pontiffs, &c. bearing on the subjects  
 “ contained in the work, as also the constitutions of Bene-  
 “ dict XIV, in which he has defined questions formerly  
 “ controverted among divines, and wherein he has decided  
 “ subjects principally regarding Moral Theology ; select  
 “ passages also are cited from his truly invaluable work on  
 “ the Diocesan Synod, in which the more difficult questions  
 “ which DENS has only slightly touched on, or may  
 “ not have sufficiently elucidated, are considered at great  
 “ length. This volume will also contain the whole of the  
 “ Epitome of the Canonical and Moral Doctrine of Benedict  
 “ the XIV. carefully selected from his several Bulls, Con-  
 “ stitutions, and other Theological Works, and alphabeti-  
 “ cally arranged with references to each particular work, by  
 “ John Dominick Mansi, Archbishop of Lucca ; presenting  
 “ thus, in a compendious form, all the decisions of this learned  
 “ Pope on various Doctrinal, Moral, and Canonical subjects.”

“The supplementary matter above referred to, has been added with the sanction and approbation of his Grace, the Most Reverend Doctor Murray.”

You have here now, brethren, the history of this important work as given in the very words of the man who has printed both editions of it; and we learn these facts:—

We see that all the Roman Catholic Prelates assembled September 14, 1808—and then unanimously agreed that it was the best and soundest summary of their Doctrines in all the theology of their Church—that they set it up in consequence as the safest guide for all the Priests throughout all their Dioceses in Ireland,—whenever they might not have an opportunity of consulting their Superiors, whose sentiments, of course, it must clearly and definitely convey.

We perceive that in consequence of this opinion, they then ‘*republished*’ (whence it seems it had been published by them before) 3000 copies, that is exactly according to the computation, a copy for every Priest in Ireland, and as the publisher was Mr. Coyne, we have his undoubted testimony of the fact.

We perceive that this book was held in such estimation by the Priests, that in 1832, there was scarcely a copy to be got, and that it had been made the standard book for the Conferences of the Clergy through the Province of Leinster, as 3000 copies had been ordered to be printed under the authority of their Bishops and all the Priests of Ireland, and therefore in the year 1832, Mr. Coyne published again a limited number of copies, but that number Mr. Coyne informed the writer of this, was 3000 more. We have therefore this book authenticated, and set up universally by the highest authorities in the Church of Rome, as containing an undoubted exposition of all their principles; published first in 1808, 3000 copies in seven volumes; again, in 1832, 3000 copies more in eight, in all

6000 copies, which, at Two Guineas a copy, which is the selling price, allowing for the additional volume in the last edition, makes the sum of Eleven Thousand Two Hundred and Fifty Guineas; a book must be of no common importance to be published for the Priests at that enormous expence.

We now come to consider the principles of this book, and as it is not my object to make this a Theological treatise, I shall confine myself strictly to those parts which concern our religion, and the judgments denounced against us by the Church of Rome.

Let me therefore lay before you some few of the questions proposed for the private conferences of the Roman Catholic Priests of Ireland in the year 1832, with the answers taken from this book which the Roman Catholic Prelates have set up for their standard and their guide.

Lest I should be accused of misrepresentation, I give the original Latin on one side, and the translation on the other; the prefatory sentence of their conferences in this year is particularly remarkable, it is as follows:—

Collationes hoc anno 1832, in Provinciâ Lageniæ, quatuor erunt in quibus (Dominum Dens auctorem sequentes) *de Virtutibus* tractatum discutiemus.

There will be four Conferences this year 1832, in the Province of Leinster, in which, following Mr. Dens as our author, we shall discuss his treatise *on the Virtues*.

The following are among the questions of these Conferences, and the answers are portions of the chapters in Dens, of which these questions generally form the title, or if not, arise in some parts of the chapters.

Utrum obligat confessio fidei externa?

Is a man obliged to make an outward confession of faith?

In reply to this it is generally laid down, that a man is

not obliged to confess his faith if interrogated by a private individual, but that he is, if interrogated by a man in a public situation; but the following are among the answers in the chapter:—

Quid si quis interrogetur, an sit Sacerdos, religiosus, episcopus, etc. an tenetur confiteri?

Responsio communis contra Pawels est negativa, quia tales tituli sunt quædam accidentia religionis, adeoque illa tacendo non censeatur aliquid essentielle fidei tacere, propterea, qui se negarit, v. g. Sacerdotem, cum talis sit, tantum mendacium officiosum committerit.

Vol. ii. p. 65.

What if any one should be asked whether he be a priest, a monk, or a bishop, is he bound to confess?

The general answer in opposition to Pawels is,—no—because such titles are certain accidents of religion, and therefore by concealing them a man is not thought to conceal any thing essential to the faith, wherefore he who should deny himself to be a Priest (for example) when he really is one, only tells a mere official lie.

These questions relate only to the Priests themselves, but they show the value they place on truth. We shall now consider the principles they lay down with respect to the members of the Protestant religion, to whatever church they may belong.

#### QUESTIONS IN THE CONFERENCE. 1832.

##### QUOT SPECIES INFIDELITATIS?

I. Responsio. In novâ lege sunt tres, scilicet Paganismus, Judaismus, et Hæresis. Ad unam harum alia quævis infidelitas reduci potest.

Quid est Paganismus?

II. Responsio. Est incredulitas eorum qui Christum

How many kinds of infidelity are there?

I. Answer. In the new dispensation there are three: viz. Paganism, Judaism, and Heresy; to one of these all other kinds of infidelity may be reduced.

What is Paganism?

II. Answer. It is the infidelity of those who neither



neque in figurâ neque in veritatis manifestatione profitentur; sive qui non agnoscunt Messiam aliquem seu Christum venisse neque venturum expectant. Tales sunt Idololatræ, Athei, Deistæ, Mahometani, etc.

Quid est Judaismus?

III. Responsio. Est incredulitas eorum qui Messiam seu Christum, confitentur in figurâ tantum sive qui negant Christum venisse, sed adhuc venturum expectant.

Quid est Hæresis?

IV. Responsio. Est incredulitas eorum qui profitentur quidem Christum venisse, sed doctrinam ejus ab ecclesiâ propositam quoad partem aliquem abjiciunt: tales sunt *Lutherani*, *Calvinistæ*, &c.

Quænam infidelitatis species est gravius peccatum?

V. Respondetur cum S. Thomâ, quæst. 10. art. 6. distinguendo. Si consideretur infidelitas objective, sive ex parte materiæ, sic Paganismus est gravior Judaismo, et Judaismus gravior Hæresi: quia Paganus in pluribus errat quam Judæus, et Judæus plus quam Hæreticus.

Si subjective, sive ex parte pertinaciæ voluntatis et renisus contra fidem, sic pessima est Hæresis, et Judaismus communiter gravior Pagan-

profess Christ in figure nor in the manifestation of the truth, or who do not acknowledge that any Messiah or Christ has come, nor expect that he will come—such are Idolaters, Atheists, Deists, Mahometans, &c.

What is Judaism?

III. Answer. It is the unbelief of those who confess the Messiah or Christ, in a figure only, or who deny that Christ has come, but expect that he will yet appear.

What is Heresy?

IV. Answer. It is the unbelief of those who profess indeed that Christ has come, but who reject his doctrine as to any part as proposed by the church, such are Lutherans, Calvinists, &c.

What kind of infidelity is the greatest sin?

V. We answer with St. Thomas, quest. 10. art. 6. by distinguishing. If the infidelity is considered *objectively*, or in reference to the subject matter of it, then Paganism is worse than Judaism, and Judaism worse than Heresy: because the Pagan errs in more particulars than the Jew, and the Jew in more than the Heretic.

But if it is considered *subjectively*, or in reference to the pertinacity of the will and the resistance to the faith, then Heresy is the worst,



ismo, quia Hæretici majorem de fidei veritatibus notitiam habere solent quam Judæi, et Judæi quam Pagani, atque adeo communiter Hæresis est culpa gravior.—Dens, vol. ii. pp. 77, 78.

and Judaism generally worse than Paganism, because Heretics are wont to have a greater knowledge of the truths of the faith than Jews, and Jews than Pagans, and so generally Heresy is the greater crime.

Here now it is manifest that the Church of Rome considers all of us Protestants, not as Christians, but as actually worse than either Jews or Pagans. But as they sometimes endeavour to evade their principles by pretending that they do not class us among Heretics, although it is clear from their own definition here, that they mark us out as the especial examples of Heretics, for Lutherans and Calvinists are names under which they designate all Protestants; yet, to obviate all doubt on the matter, I shall quote some brief extracts from the chapters in Dens, that are answers to some of their other questions.

They have in this Conference the following questions:—

**ANNE DEMUM HÆRETICI CENSENTUR HABERE FIDEM?**

On this the Chapter from Dens, entitled, ‘An Fides sit in Hæretico,’ replies,

I. Quæstio non est de Hæretico materiali, nam certum est talem non amittere fidem: sed de Hæretico formali sive de eo qui pertinaciter discredet unum fidei articulum quem novit sufficienter ab Ecclesia propositum.

II. Ad hanc quæstionem Theologicum S. Thomæ, com-

**ARE HERETICS THEN CONSIDERED TO HAVE FAITH?**

I. The question is not about a Heretic merely in matter, for it is certain that such an one does not lose faith: but about a formal Heretic, or one who pertinaciously disbelieves one article of faith which he has known to be sufficiently proposed by the Church.

II. To this question Theologians, with St. Thomas,

muniter respondent, quod quicumque cum pertinaciâ discredet unum fidei articulum non habeat actum fidei nec habitum circa reliquos articulos.

III. Probatur: imprimis non potest in ipso maneri habitus fidei, quia hic deperditur per peccatum Hæresis fidei directe oppositum ut docet Trid. Sess. 6. cap. 15. ubi dicit fidem per infidelitatem amitti: jam autem Hæresis est infidelitas, ergo, &c.

IV. Neque etiam in tali dari potest actus fidei: quia rejecit objectum formale fidei sine quo actus fidei exerceri nequit.

Quod autem tale objectum formale fidei abjiciat patet ex eo quod unica et indivisibilis ratio formalis credendi sit prima veritas, prout manifestatur per Ecclesiam: atque prima veritas est applicata omnibus articulis et æqualiter illi ab Ecclesia proponuntur: ergo qui pertinaciter discredet unum articulum, convincitur non assentire reliquis ob motivum formale fidei sed ob proprii cerebri persuasionem, sicque nullum articulum credit fide divinâ. Hinc dicit S. Aug: "qui in Evangelio quod vultis creditis quod vultis non cre-

commonly answer, that whosoever with pertinacity disbelieves one article of faith, has neither an act of faith, nor a habit of faith (Qu. actual or habitual faith) about the other articles.

III. This is thus proved: a habit of faith cannot remain in him, because this is lost by the sin of Heresy, which is directly opposed to faith, as the Council of Trent teaches, Sess. 6. cap. 15. where it says, that faith is lost by infidelity; but Heresy is infidelity, therefore faith is lost by it.

IV. Nor can an act of faith be given in such a person, because he rejects the formal object of faith without which an act of faith cannot be exercised.

But that he rejects such formal object of faith is plain from this, that the one and indivisible formal reason of believing is the first truth, as it is manifested by the Church, and the first truth is applied to all articles, and they are equally proposed to him by the Church—therefore he who pertinaciously discredits one article, is convicted of not assenting to the others on account of the formal motive of faith, but on account of the persuasion of his own brain, and thus he believes no article with a divine faith, hence St. Au-

ditis, vobis potius quam Evangelio creditis."

Objec. I. Calvinista dis-credit articulum de reali presentiâ Christi in Eucharistiâ atqui tamen credit mysterium S. S. Trinitatis fide divinâ: ergo, &c.

Respondetur negando minorem—acceptat quidem veritatem ipsam, sed non per assensum supernaturalem, sed per assensum humanum, v. g. per fidem humanam, vel per habitum acquisitum, vel ex pertinacia voluntatis, vel etiam ob evidentiam signorum, non autem ob motivum formale fidei, sive ob primam veritatem. Si enim prima veritas ipsum moveret ad credendum unum articulum, crederet propter eandem omnes, cum prima veritas ad credendum omnes æqualiter moverit.

Dens, vol. ii. pp. 72, 73.

gustine saith, "You who believe what you wish in the Gospel, and disbelieve what you wish, believe in yourselves rather than in the Gospel."

Objection I. The Calvinist disbelieves the article of the Real Presence in the Eucharist, nevertheless he believes the mystery of the Holy Trinity with a divine faith: therefore, &c.

This is answered by denying the minor—he believes indeed the truth itself, but not by a supernatural assent, but by a human assent, that is, by a human faith, or by a habit acquired, or from pertinacity of his will, or even on account of the evidence of signs, but not from the formal motive of faith, or from the first truth. For if the first truth moved him to believe one article, he would believe on the same ground all the articles, since the first truth would equally move him to believe them all.

Now from this, it is perfectly clear, that the Church of Rome declares that Heresy is Infidelity, and that all faith is lost by it, so that a Heretic can neither habitually believe the articles of the Christian faith, nor actually believe even any one article, and the reason is because he refuses to receive it on the authority of the Church of Rome; the objection adduced is one which places the principles in the clearest light, for it brings forward the example of what they call a Calvinist, who is supposed to believe in the Holy



Trinity, but to reject the doctrine of transubstantiation, and it is inferred hence that a man can believe an article of the Christian faith though he does not believe all that the Church of Rome proposes—His belief then of this one article is denied to be true faith, it is ascribed to a mere human persuasion—a mere habit—or even obstinacy, or the evidence of signs, but not admitted to be a real faith, because he does not take it on the authority of the Church, and therefore since he does not believe every thing the Church teaches, he is an obstinate heretic, and believes nothing as he ought to do.

The principle which is applied here individually, is given to us by wholesale in another passage.

In the chapter which treats, “*De Hæresi in particulari*,” in which there is the answer to their question, What is Heresy, and how divided?—they divide it into *Material Heresy* and *formal Heresy*,—the former means an error in the faith without obstinacy, the latter an error in the faith with obstinacy; if for example, a man disbelieves the doctrine of transubstantiation, that is, a material heresy; but if when the Church of Rome explains it to him, he receives her explanation, then it is of no consequence, he has given up his heresy. But if he does not receive the church’s explanation, and give up his heresy, then it becomes more than a material heresy, it is a formal heresy, that is the worst kind, and subjecting him to all the consequences of his crime; this distinction, without quoting at unnecessary length, is necessary to understand the wholesale condemnation of all the Protestants in Holland, exhibited in the following sentence.

<p>Quomodo, si ad hæresim formalem requiritur pertinacia, Hæretici, v. g. in Hollandia reputari possunt hæretici formales, cum illi ex</p>	<p>How, if pertinacity is required to constitute formal heresy, can the Heretics for instance, in Holland, be counted formal heretics, since</p>
--	--

ignorantia sibi persuadeant sectam suam esse veram religionem?

VI. R. Tametsi multi inter illos laborent ignorantia, quâ putant sectam suam esse veram religionem, ipsa tamen eorum ignorantia communiter est ex animi alienatione, a fide et cum pertinacia sufficientia ex hæresim, (qu. sufficienti ad hæresim?) quia sufficienter in eorum notitiam devenit Ecclesia Romano-Catholica suis notis credibilitatis præfulgens, suæque sectæ incredibilitas: ex quibus satis dignoscere possunt, Ecclesiam Romano-Catholicam, esse veram, Christi Ecclesiam adeoque audiendam esse, tanquam regulam infallibilem secundum quam prima veritas revelans nobis manifestatur, hanc autem Ecclesiam vel rejiceunt vel negant esse solam Christi Ecclesiam.

they from ignorance persuade themselves that their sect is the true religion?

VI. We answer, although many among them labour under ignorance, by which they think that their sect is the true religion; nevertheless, that very ignorance generally springs from an alienation of mind from the faith, and with a pertinacity sufficient to constitute heresy, because the Roman Catholic Church hath sufficiently come among them, shining with her marks of credibility, and also the incredibility of their own sect; from which they can sufficiently know that the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, and so is to be heard as the infallible rule, according to which the first revealing truth is manifested to us, but this church they either reject or deny to be the only Church of Christ.

Here we perceive the principle conclusively established, that either individuals or nations who do not confess the authority, and receive the doctrines of the Church of Rome wherever she is, or is known, are formal heretics; whether in Holland, England, Scotland, or Ireland, the principle is the same in all; and it is indispensably necessary to know this, that we may fully understand the doctrines which are held, and the decrees that are laid down by the Bishops and Priests of the Romish Apostacy against us at this day.

Here I must mark one point of peculiar ignorance and



blindness on the part of all the British nation on this subject; they talk of the Church of Rome and the Dissenting Churches, as if they stood on the same ground with respect to the Established Church, or to each other, whereas there is one essential point in which the Church of Rome differs from every other body that ever bore the name of Christian; that difference is this,—all other bodies of Christians who differ however widely from the Established Church, or from each other, no matter what their opinions or their errors may be, however various, or however fatal; yet there is one point in which they all agree, namely, that they possess no right, natural or acquired, from either the authority of God or man, to trample on the rights of conscience, or to tyrannize over the minds, persons, liberties or lives of their fellow-creatures on account of their religion. They may believe them to be in error—it may be, in fatal error; they may consider it their duty to expose, to denounce that error, to warn them of its consequences; but they do so as freemen to those that are free, and not as tyrants to those that are slaves.

But the Church of Rome dares to arrogate to herself a power which she claims as delegated from God—a power by which all who bear the name of Christian, who are baptized into any church however heretical she may count the church, yet all who are baptized into it, are by baptism brought under the power of her authority; if they refuse to obey her, she seizes them as rebels and deserters when she dares to do so—holds it out as her principle and her right to refuse them liberty of conscience, to extirpate the rites of their worship, to compel them by corporal punishments to return to the faith of Popery; and those punishments are confiscation of their property, exile, imprisonment, and death.

These principles you will see laid down in the private conferences of the Priests of Ireland in the year I have

stated; and accordingly we shall proceed to show first, that they refuse toleration to our worship.

#### QUESTION.

ANNE LICITUM RITUS INFIDELIUM TOLERARE?

I. Respondetur, 1mo.—Ritus Judæorum etsi peccent in illis exercendis, cum quâdam moderatione tolerari possunt: quia inde magnum bonum ecclesiæ provenit, scilicet, quod testimonium fidei nostræ habeamus ab hostibus cum per eorum ritus quasi in figurâ nobis represententur illa, quæ credimus.

Dictum est, ‘cum quâdam moderatione,’ quia si periculum sit ne Judæi per suos ritus scandalosint Christianis, ecclesia potest ac debet eos moderare vel impedire prout fuerit expediens.—Hinc statutum est lib. 5. Decret. 6: cap. 3. et 7. Ne Judæis liceat habere, plures synagogas in una civitate nec novas in pluribus locis ædificare.

II. Respondetur 2do.—Ritus aliorum infidelium nempe paganorum et hæreticorum per se non sunt tolerandi; quia ita sunt mali ut nihil veritatis aut utilitatis in bonum ecclesiæ inde derivetur.

IS IT LAWFUL TO TOLERATE THE RITES OF UNBELIEVERS?

This is answered, first,—The rites of the Jews, although they sin in exercising them, may be tolerated with *a certain degree of moderation, because from thence great good accrues to the church, namely, that we have a testimony to our faith from our enemies*, since by their rites those things which we believe are represented to us as in a figure.

It is said, ‘*with a certain degree of moderation,*’ because if there be any danger that the Jews by their rites, prove a scandal to Christians, the church *can and ought to moderate, or even to prevent it, as may be expedient*. Hence it has been decreed in the 5th Book of Decretals, 6th chap. 3 and 7. that it may not be lawful for the Jews to have many synagogues in one state, nor to build new ones in many places.

We answer 2ndly.—The rites of the other unbelievers, namely, of pagans and heretics, *are not in themselves to be tolerated, because they are so bad that no truth or utility can from thence be derived to the good of the church*.

Excipe tamen, nisi aliunde majora mala sequerentur, vel majora bona impediuntur.

Obj. 1. Apost. ad Rom. cap. 14, v. 5. dicit, "Unusquisque in suo sensu abundet." Ergo cuilibet relinquenda est libertas religionis.

*Except however, that some greater evils might accrue from some other source, or some greater good be prevented.*

Objection 1. The Apostle to the Romans, chap. xiv. verse 5, says, "Let every man abound in his own sense," (we translate the Greek, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.") Therefore, liberty of religion is to be left to every man.

Let me here pause to observe that this is the great principle of all religious toleration—that a man in the worship of his God might be at liberty to worship him according to the dictates of his conscience, and that he should not be held responsible for the conscientious exercise of his religion before the tribunal of his fellow-creatures. The Church of Rome here supposes this principle to be urged as an objection to her doctrines—and does she admit it?—does she admit that which Mr. O'Connell vaunted of some years ago in his address to the Dissenters of England—"we desire," saith he "to bring into practical operation this great principle of individual duty and social right, **THAT EVERY HUMAN BEING SHOULD WORSHIP GOD ACCORDING TO THE SINCERE DICTATES OF HIS CONSCIENTIOUS BELIEF.**" He adds, "This is, we assert, *an universal principle*, not confined to one sect or persuasion, but extended to every existing, and to every possible mode of Christian belief."

"*The Catholics of Ireland have ever grounded their Petitions for Emancipation on this great principle of*



“*freedom of conscience.*”—O’Connell and Shiel’s Speeches, page 500.

Now let us try the worth of these assertions. Here is this principle brought to the test.—The Popish Bishops and Priests of Ireland anticipate this as an objection against their intolerance of our worship, they suppose an objector to urge that the Apostle says, “Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.” Therefore liberty of religion is to be left to every man. How do they meet this? Do they admit it? Do they tolerate the principle?—Mark.

Respondetur negando consequentem, nam non agit Apostolus de ritibus religionis, sed de dierum et ciborum discrimine secundum legem Moysis observando vel non observando, quod utrumque tunc temporis poterat bene fieri.

“This is answered by denying the consequence—(that is, *by denying that liberty of conscience is to be left to every man*) for the Apostle is not treating of the rites of religion, but of the observance or non-observance of the difference of days and meats according to the law of Moses, either of which might well be done at that time.

We have now another plea urged for liberty of conscience :—

Objec. II. Dilemma Gamalielis, Acts cap. v. verse 38 et 39, ubi de illis, quæ faciebant Apostoli dicit “Sinite illos, quoniam si est ex hominibus consilium hoc aut opus, dissolvetur: si vero ex Deo est, non poteritis dissolvere illud.

Objection II. The Dilemma of Gamaliel, Acts chap. v. verse 38 and 39. Where he is speaking of those things which the Apostles were doing, “Refrain from these men and let them alone, for if this counsel or this work be of man it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it.”

Respondetur 1mo, Dilemma istud non est Scripturæ sacræ sed Gamalielis, qui hoc argumento apparenti voluit Apostolos quibus favebat præsentī periculo eripere.

Respondetur 2do, Dato quod Gamalielis argumentatio subsistat, disparitas est quod causa infidelium non sit Judicibus Ecclesiæ dubia prout causa Apostolorum erat Judæis, sed constat illam certo falsam esse et damnatam, unde tentanda non est vel probanda sed extirpanda, nisi adsint rationes quæ illam tolerandam esse suadeant. Dens. vol. ii. pp. 82, 83.

We answer 1st, *This is a dilemma not of the Sacred Scripture but of Gamaliel*, who, by this apparent argument, wished to rescue the Apostles, whom he favored, from present danger.

We answer, 2ndly, that granting the argument of Gamaliel to be valid, there is this difference, *that the cause of unbelievers is not doubtful to the judges of the church as that of the Apostles was to the Jews*, but it is clear THAT IT IS CERTAINLY FALSE AND CONDEMNED, whence it is NOT TO BE TRIED OR APPROVED BUT EXTIRPATED, *unless there may be some prudential reasons which may induce us to tolerate it.*

Such, brethren, are the blessings and privileges of Romish toleration; such the faith Romanists keep with heretics for granting them, not toleration but privileges, not only privileges but power.

We shall now enter upon another part of the subject; since they avow their intention of exterminating our worship whenever *prudential reasons* may permit, it may be important that you should see they are not so entirely regardless of our spiritual interests as to leave us without any religion, so it now remains for us to consider what provision popery may be pleased to make for us and for our children in this respect. You find this in the following question proposed by the Romish bishops for the conferences of the priests, and the authoritative answer set forth in Dens's book to guide them in the subject.



## QUESTION.

ANNE COGENDI  
INFIDELES GREMIO  
FIDELIUM SESE AD-  
JUNGERE?

I. Respondetur, Imo.— Infideles qui nunquam baptizati sunt, non possunt compelli ad fidem suscipiendam: imprimis non ab Ecclesia; quia nullam habet jurisdictionem in non baptizatos juxta illud I. ad Corinth; cap. 5. ver. 12. Quid mihi de iis qui foris sunt judicare? neque etiam a principibus sæcularibus, licet eorum superioribus; quia tantum habent potestatem politicam quæ solum respicit pacem et tranquillitatem publicam.

Idem probant exempla Christi, Ecclesiæ doctrina et praxis, ac forma Matth. x. in prædicando Apostolis præscripta.

Notandum tamen quod infideles non baptizati, quamvis ad fidem compelli nequeant, a suis principibus cogi possint ut legem naturæ observent; adeoque ut abstineant a blasphemiiis in Deum, idololatria, &c. ratio est quod rectus ordo politicus in legis naturæ observatione fundetur.

II. Infideles etiam non

ARE UNBELIEVERS  
TO BE COMPELLED TO  
JOIN THEMSELVES  
TO THE BOSOM OF  
THE FAITHFUL?

I. We answer first—Unbelievers who have never been baptized cannot be compelled to receive the faith: in the first place, not by the Church, because she has no jurisdiction over the unbaptized, according to the 1st Corinthians, chap. v. ver. 12. “What have I to do to judge them that are without?” nor even by secular, although their superior, because they have only a political power over them, which merely respects the public peace and tranquillity.

The same also is proved by the example of Christ, the doctrine and practice of the Church, and the form prescribed to the Apostles in preaching. Matt. x.

It is to be marked however that unbelievers unbaptized, although they cannot be compelled to the faith by their princes, can be compelled to observe the law of nature, and so to abstain from blasphemies against God, from idolatry, &c. the reason is, that proper political order is founded in the observance of the law of nature.

II. Unbelievers even

subditi Principi Christiano, compelli possunt, ne fidei prædicationem in suis locis impediunt: ratio est quod Ecclesia habet jus et potestatem prædicandi Evangelium per universam orbem, quod illi concessit Christus, Matth. cap. ult. v. 19. "*Docete omnes gentes,*" et Mar. cap. 16. v. 15. "*Prædicate Evangelium omni creaturæ.*"

Si ergo Ecclesia in isto jure impediatur, possunt Principes Christiani tanquam Ecclesiæ defensores, bello vel aliis modis compescere eos qui fidei prædicationem impedire conantur.

Hoc pacto Alexander VI. Hispanis et Lusitanis Indiam dividit, dividendo nimirum inter illos directe curam et jus coercendi armis fidei prædicationi obsistentes; has autem terras existente justâ causa belli principes illi sibi occupare potuerunt.

Juxta Suarez, Herincx, &c, potest Princeps Catholicus infideles sibi subjectos sub pænâ exilii cogere ut certis temporibus intersint prædicationi Evangelii, quia juxta constitutionem Gregorii XIII. Judæi Romæ degentes coguntur singulis hebdomadibus semel interesse

though not subjects to a Christian Prince, may be compelled not to hinder the preaching of the Gospel in their places; the reason is that the Church has a right and power of preaching the Gospel through the whole world, which Christ has granted to her. Matt. last chap. v. 19. "*Teach all nations,*" and Mark xvth chap. v. 15. "*Preach the Gospel to every creature.*"

If therefore the Church should be hindered in that right, Christian Princes as defenders of the church; can by war, or other means, repress those who endeavour to impede the preaching of the gospel.

By this means Alexander the VIth. divided India to the Spaniards and Portuguese, namely, by dividing among them directly the *care and right of coercing by arms*, those who resisted the preaching of the faith; but these princes, when a just cause of war existed, could seize upon those countries for themselves.

According to Suarez, Herincx, and others, a Catholic Prince can *compel* the unbelievers under his dominion, under pain of *banishment*, that at certain times they should be present at the preaching of the gospel, because according to the constitution of Gregory XIII.

concioni de rebus fidei Christianæ.

Objec. Dicitur Luc. cap. 14, v. 23. "Exi in vias et 'sepas et compelle intrare,'" ergo omnes infideles cogi possunt ad fidem suscipiendam.

Respondetur negando consequentem. Verba enim parabolæ juxta St. Gregor. intelliguntur de compulsione improprie dictâ quæ fit per prædicationem, persuasionem, ostentationem miraculorum, &c.

Si autem cum S. Augustino, verba intelligas de compulsione propriè dictâ, tum de hæreticis et schismaticis accipiuntur qui fidem aliquando sunt professi, quique propriè compelli possunt.

III. Respondetur 2do. ad quæstionem. Infideles baptizati quales esse solent hæretici et apostatæ, item schismatici baptizati, cogi possunt etiam pænis corporalibus ut revertantur ad fidem Catholicam et unitatem Ecclesiæ.

the Jews living at Rome are *compelled* to be present once every seven days at the preaching of the things of the Christian faith.

Objection. It is said, Luke, chap. 14, v. 23. "Go "out into the highways and "hedges, and compel them "to come in," therefore all unbelievers can be compelled to receive the faith.

This is answered by denying the consequent; for according to St. Gregory, the words of the parable are to be understood of *compulsion, improperly so called, which is used by preaching, persuasion, showing of miracles, &c.*

But if with St. Augustine, you understand the words of compulsion, properly so called, then they are understood of *heretics and schismatics who have at some time made profession of faith, and WHO CAN PROPERLY SPEAKING BE COMPELLED.*

III. We answer 2ndly to the question, that *Unbelievers who have been baptized as heretics and apostates generally are, and also' baptized schismatics, CAN BE COMPELLED BY CORPORAL PUNISHMENTS TO RETURN TO THE CATHOLIC FAITH AND THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.*



Ratio est, quod isti per baptismum subditi facti sunt Ecclesiæ, adeoque Ecclesia in eos jurisdictionem habet, et potestatem eos compellendi per media ordinata ad obedientiam et ad implendas obligationes in baptismo contractas.

Id etiam locum habet in his qui baptizati sunt in infantiâ aut metu vel necessitate quâdam compulsi baptismum susceperunt, ut docet Concil. Trid. Sess. 7, Can. 14, et Toletanum 4tum. Can. 55.

Objec. Nemo credit nisi volens, atque voluntas cogi non potest; ergo nemo potest cogi ad fidem.

Respondetur negando consequentem, non enim cogitur ut nolens credat sed ut ex nolente fiat volens.

Instabis: Nemo potest cogi ad baptismum ergo, etc.

Respondetur cum S. Thomâ, sicut vovere est volentis, reddere autem necessitatis; ita accipere fidem est voluntatis, sed acceptam

*The reason is, that they by baptism are made* **SUBJECTS OF THE CHURCH, AND THEREFORE THE CHURCH HAS JURISDICTION OVER THEM, AND THE POWER OF COMPELLING THEM BY THE APPOINTED MEANS TO OBEDIENCE, and to fulfil the obligations contracted in their baptism.**

This also obtains in the case of those who have been baptized in their infancy, or who compelled by fear or any necessity have received baptism; as the Council of Trent teaches, Session 7, Canon 14; and the 4th Council of Toledo, Can. 55.

You may object—‘No one believes against his will, but the will cannot be compelled, therefore no one can be compelled to the faith.’

We answer by denying the consequent, *for he is not compelled to believe against his will, but that* **FROM BEING UNWILLING, HE SHOULD BE MADE WILLING.**

You will urge again. No one can be compelled to baptism, therefore no one to the faith.

We answer with St. Thomas on this:—‘as to vow is the part of a willing mind, but to pay what is vowed is of necessity; so, *to receive the*

tenere est necessitatis, atque adeo hæretici compelli possunt ut fidem teneant.

Interim non semper expedit ut Ecclesia hoc jure utatur prout patebit ex infra dicendis.

Dens, Vol. II. pp. 79—81.

*faith is the part of the will, but to hold it when received, is of necessity, and THEREFORE HERETICS CAN BE COMPELLED TO HOLD THE FAITH.'*

MEANTIME IT IS NOT ALWAYS EXPEDIENT THAT THE CHURCH SHOULD USE THIS RIGHT, as will appear from what shall be said hereafter.

Perhaps a system of equal religious intolerance was never yet recorded in print. Let us pause and meditate a moment on its enormity.

Every creature who has ever been baptized in any church, whether voluntarily as an adult, or in infancy, or by compulsion, no matter how, is by baptism made subject to the domination of the Church of Rome, comes under her jurisdiction, and is to be compelled by corporal punishments to go over to the faith of Popery; not, observe, forced *to believe against his will*, but forced *to be willing to believe*—that is, he is to be brought to the rack, or the scaffold, or the stake, and to be forced to prefer the profession of her faith to the cruelty of her persecution. It is only necessary to point out to you one or two more passages in which it is set forth—first, that the baptism of heretics is valid, and is, that which is meant here. Secondly, the authority which is claimed over all who are baptized, expressed if possible in stronger language.

First, lest Romanists should deny that they considered us as baptized, and that not being validly baptized, we did not come under their jurisdiction and their ban; we recite the decision of Dens on this question, thus:—



Non requiritur ut minister explicite intendat facere quod facit Ecclesia Romana, sed sufficit ut simpliciter et generatim volet facere quod Christus instituit, vel quod facit vera Ecclesia quæcunque illius sit sententia de Ecclesia, ut declarat praxis Ecclesiæ ratum habentis baptismum Hæreticorum.

Sed quid si haberet duas intentiones repugnantes, viz. Hæreticus baptizat intendens facere quod Christus instituit, aut quod facit sua Ecclesia sed non quod facit Ecclesia Romana?

Respondetur. Talis moraliter loquendo valide baptizat.—Dens, vol. v. p. 133.

Whence it is indisputably clear, that all of us who are baptized into any church called heretical, are baptized with sufficient validity, to bring us within the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome.

Then mark, brethren, the nature of this jurisdiction, which occurs in innumerable parts of this work. In the chapter which treats ‘of those who are in the Church,’ we find the following passages.

Qu. An omnes baptizati sunt in Ecclesiâ?

Respondetur. Negative. Et imprimis hæretici et apostatæ manifesti non sunt de

It is not required that a minister should explicitly intend to do that which the Roman Church does, but *it is sufficient that he should simply and generally intend to do that which Christ instituted, or that which the true Church does, whatsoever his opinion of that Church may be, as the practice of the Church declares, which holds the baptism of Heretics to be valid.*

But what if he should have two conflicting intentions, as for example: The Heretic baptizes, intending to do that which Christ instituted, or what his own Church does, but not what the Roman Church does?

We answer. Such a man morally speaking, baptizes in a valid manner.

Are all who have been baptized in the Church?

We answer. No. And particularly *heretics* and apostates are evidently not of the

**Ecclesia:** quia non profitemur eandem fidem et doctrinam cum iis qui sunt in Ecclesiâ, quod tamen in definitione Ecclesiæ exprimitur.

**Objec.** Ecclesia judicat et punit hæreticos: atqui non judicat eos qui foris sunt juxta Apost. 1 ad Cor. cap. 5, ergo sunt in Ecclesia.

**Respondetur** negando consequentem; quamvis enim hæretici sint extra ecclesiam; manent tamen ratione Baptismi Ecclesiæ subjecti, unde merito illos sumit tanquam transfugas ex Ecclesiæ castris, adeoque redeundi obligationem habent: Apostolus vero agit de illis qui nunquam intrârunt Ecclesiam sive qui baptizati non sunt. Dens. vol. ii. p. 114.

Again in the chapter of "Infidels and Heretics being subject to the law," we meet the following passage:

Hæretici, Schismatici, Apostatæ et similes omnes baptizati obligantur legibus Ecclesiæ quæ ipsos concernunt, neque magis a legibus ejus solvuntur quam subditi contra legitimum principem rebelles a legibus principis.

Church, because they do not profess the same faith and doctrine with those who are in the Church, which, nevertheless, is expressed in the definition of the Church.

**Objection.** The Church judges and punishes heretics, but she does not "judge those that are without," according to the Apostle, 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. v. therefore heretics are in the Church.

We answer, by denying the consequent, for although heretics are without the Church, nevertheless they remain by reason of Baptism, subject to the Church, whence she justly seizes them as deserters from the camp of the Church, and so they are under the obligation of returning, but the Apostle is treating of those who have never entered the Church, or who have not been baptized.

Heretics, Schismatics, Apostates and all similar persons who have been baptized *are bound by the laws of the Church which concern them; nor are they more released from her laws THAN* SUBJECTS REBEL-

## LING AGAINST THEIR LAWFUL PRINCE ARE RELEASED FROM THE LAWS OF THAT PRINCE.

Objec. 1mo. Hæretici non sunt in Ecclesiâ, ergo non sunt subditi Ecclesiæ.

Respondetur distinguendo antecedentem. Hæretici non sunt in Ecclesiâ quantum ad unionem charitatis et communionis sanctorum, conceditur antecedens. Non sunt in Ecclesiâ quoad subjectionem, negatur antecedens: etenim per Baptisma facti sunt subditi Ecclesiæ, et manent personaliter Ecclesiæ subjecti ubicunque fuerint.

Objec. 2d. Ecclesia videtur relaxare leges suas respectu hæreticorum quia urgendo observantiam legum nullum bonum effectum expectare potest, sed magis peccata illorum et offensas Dei, ergo, &c.

Respondetur negando antecedentem. Contrarium patet ex mente universâ Ecclesiæ: ad peccata autem illorum Ecclesia se habet mere permissive ob altiores rationes, ne scilicet cum aperto scandalo fidelium, favere videatur hæresi, dum

Objection. Heretics are not in the Church, therefore they are not subject to the Church.

We answer by distinguishing the antecedent. If it means that heretics are not in the Church, as far as relates to the union of charity and communion of the saints, we grant it. But if it means that they are not in the Church *as to subjection*, we deny it, for they are made by Baptism subject to the Church and THEY REMAIN PERSONALLY SUBJECT TO THE CHURCH WHERESOEVER THEY MAY BE.

Objection 2nd. The Church seems to relax her laws in respect of heretics, because by urging the observance of the laws she cannot expect any good effect, but rather their sins and offences against God, therefore, &c.

We answer by denying the antecedent (that is, observe, by denying that the Church seems to relax her laws in respect of heretics.) The contrary appears from the universal mind of the Church, but as to their sins, the Church merely holds herself



hæretici ex pertinaciâ suâ obtinerent commodum, et liberarentur ab oneribus legum quibus fideles subjiuntur. Deinde eadem ratio relaxandi militaret pro omnibus malis Christianis.

PERMISSIVELY *for higher reasons*, lest perhaps she might seem with an open scandal of the faithful to favour heresy while heretics should derive advantage from their pertinacity and be freed from the burthen of those laws to which the faithful are subjected; hence the same reason of relaxing her discipline would hold for all bad Christians.

In this you perceive, as clearly as it can be written, the domineering principles of the Church of Rome; you see how clearly she asserts a despotic right over our consciences, our liberties, our persons; that she treats us as deserters from a camp, as rebels against a lawful prince; and the apparent suspension of her authority, or her persecution, she here declares to be only a mere permission on account of "*higher reasons*,"—namely, that it is not exactly *prudent for her to make the experiment* at present. But now we come to consider the privileges enjoyed by her subjects, and the penalties which, as deserters and rebels, she pronounces upon us. Among the questions on the subject of heresy, in the conference of 1832, we find the following answers taken from Dens, in his chapter on the Punishments of Heresy.

#### QUESTION.

“QUÆ PŒNÆ CONTRA ISTA LABE INFECTOS LATÆ?”

Hæretici notorii sunt infames ipso jure et privantur sepulturâ Ecclesiasticâ.

*What are the punishments decreed against those infected with that stain?*

Heretics that are known to be such are *infamous* for this very cause itself, and are deprived of Christian burial.



Bona eorum temporalia sunt ipso jure confiscata; debet tamen ante executionem præcedere sententia super crimen declaratoria a Judice Ecclesiastico, quia cognitio de heresi est fori Ecclesiastici.

Denique aliis poenis etiam corporalibus ut exilio, carcere, &c. merito afficiuntur.

An hæretici recte puniuntur morte?

Respondet: S. Thom. 22. quæst. 11: art. 3 in corp. affirmative: quia falsarii pecuniæ vel alii Rempubicam turbantes justè morte puniuntur; ergo etiam hæretici qui sunt falsarii fidei, et experienciâ teste Rempubicam graviter perturbant.

Confirmatur ex eo quod Deus in veteri Lege jusserit occidi falsos Prophetas. Et Deut: cap. 17. v. 12. statuatur, ut qui superbierit nolens obedere Sacerdotis imperio——moriatur. Vide etiam, cap. 18.

Idem probatur ex condem-

Their *temporal goods* are for this very cause itself *confiscated*; but before the execution of the act, the sentence declaratory of their crime ought to proceed from the Ecclesiastical Judge, because *the cognizance of heresy lies in the Ecclesiastical tribunal*.

Finally, they are also justly afflicted with other *corporal punishments as with exile, imprisonment, &c.*

Are heretics justly punished with DEATH?

St. Thomas answers 22 quest. 11. art. 3. in corp. YES—*because forgers of money or other disturbers of the State are justly punished with death*, THEREFORE ALSO HERETICS WHO ARE FORGERS OF THE FAITH, AND AS EXPERIENCE TESTIFIES, GRIEVOUSLY DISTURB THE STATE.

*This is confirmed, because God in the Old Testament ordered the false Prophets to be slain; and in Deut. chap. 17. v. 12, it is DECREED THAT IF ANY ONE WILL ACT PROUDLY AND WILL NOT OBEY THE COMMANDS OF THE PRIEST, LET HIM BE PUT TO DEATH. See also the 18th chap.*

THE SAME IS PROV-

natione articuli 14, Jona  
Huss, in Concilio Constanti-  
ensi.

ED FROM THE CON-  
DEMNATION OF THE  
14th ARTICLE OF JOHN  
HUSS, IN THE COUN-  
CIL OF CONSTANCE.

Here, brethren, is fact—here is irresistible proof—here is demonstration—here are the very worst and vilest principles of intolerance and persecution that have ever disgraced the worst councils. I challenge the page of universal history to produce one example in which, in the same number of lines, a more determined spirit of persecution is exhibited than in this—here you see the practical operation of that principle expressed in the note of their Quarto Bible, published in Dublin, 1816, on this very passage in Deuteronomy—that note is as follows :—“ *Here we see what authority God was pleased to give to the Church guides of the Old Testament, in deciding without appeal all controversies relating to the law, promising that they should not err therein : and punishing with DEATH such as proudly refused to obey their decision ; AND SURELY HE HAS NOT DONE LESS FOR THE CHURCH GUIDES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*”

The Council of Constance which, in the principles it included, and the crimes it perpetrated, in the violation of faith with John Huss, (who was murdered with the Emperor Sigismund's consent, by that Council, while he had that Emperor's pledge for his protection in his possession) has ever been considered as the most flagrant instance of treachery and persecution. Yet we see the example and the authority of this Council in this very murder, quoted as the precedent, and the infallible rule according to which we may be put to death for our religion in the year 1835. I will now only add one fact more.

In the year 1826, when it was the interest of the

Church of Rome to blind the Protestant Government, the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops assembled to make a declaration and protest, and to give their sentiments as ratified by an oath to the Protestants of the Empire. The smoothness and plausible tendency of this address is much to be remarked,—it begins—

“ At a time when the spirit of calm inquiry is abroad, and  
 “ men seem anxious to resign those prejudices through which  
 “ they viewed the doctrines of others ; the Archbishop  
 “ and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland,  
 “ avail themselves with pleasure of the dispassionate tone of  
 “ the public mind, to exhibit a simple and correct view of  
 “ those tenets that are most frequently misrepresented.

“ If it please the Almighty that the Catholics of Ireland  
 “ should be doomed to continue in the humble and degraded  
 “ condition in which they are now placed, they will submit  
 “ with resignation to the divine will. The Prelates however  
 “ conceive it *a duty which they owe to themselves, as well as*  
 “ *to their Protestant fellow-subjects, whose good opinion*  
 “ *they value, to endeavour once more to remove the false*  
 “ *impressions that have been frequently cast upon the faith*  
 “ *and discipline of that church which is entrusted to their*  
 “ *care, that all may be enabled to know with accuracy the*  
 “ *genuine principles of those men who are proscribed by law*  
 “ from any participation in the honour, dignities, and  
 “ emoluments of the state.”

Their Declaration is divided then into fourteen heads, which are numbered—and in the last they conclude with the same protestation.

“ Whilst we have in the foregoing Declaration endeavoured to state in the simplicity of truth, such doctrines of our Church as are frequently misunderstood or misrepresented amongst our fellow-subjects, to the great detriment of the public welfare and of Christian charity ;



“ and whilst we have disclaimed anew those errors or wicked principles which have been imputed to Catholics, we also avail ourselves of the present occasion, to express our readiness at all times to give, when required by the competent authority, authentic and true information upon all subjects connected with the doctrine and discipline of our Church, and to deprecate the injustice of having our faith and principles judged of by reports made of them by persons either avowedly ignorant of, or but imperfectly acquainted with, the nature of our Church government, its doctrines, laws, usages, and discipline.

“ This Declaration we approve, subscribe, and publish, as well that those who have formed erroneous opinions of our doctrines and our principles, may be at length undeceived; as that you, dearly beloved, be made strong in that faith which you have inherited as the children of saints, who look for that life which God will give to those that have never changed their faith from him.”—Job ii. 18.

“ Reverend Brothers—beloved children, “ Grace, mercy, and peace be to you from God the Father, and from Christ Jesus our Lord.” 1 Tim. i. 2.

Dublin, 25th January, 1826.

✠ Patrick Curtis, D. D.  
 ✠ Oliver Kelly, D. D.  
 ✠ Farrell O'Reilly, D. D.  
 ✠ Peter M'Loughlin, D. D.  
 ✠ James Magauran, D. D.  
 ✠ George T. Plunkett, D. D.  
 ✠ James Keating, D. D.  
 ✠ Charles Tuohy, D. D.  
 ✠ Edward Kiernan, D. D.  
 ✠ Patrick Kelly, D. D.  
 ✠ Cornelius Egan, D. D.  
 ✠ William Crolly, D. D.  
 ✠ Patrick Maguire, D. D.  
 ✠ Patrick M'Mahon, D. D.  
 ✠ John M'Hale, D. D.

✠ Daniel Murray, D. D.  
 ✠ Robert Laffan, D. D.  
 ✠ J. O'Shaughnessy, D. D.  
 ✠ Thomas Cortello, D. D.  
 ✠ Kieran Marum, D. D.  
 ✠ Peter Waldron, D. D.  
 ✠ John Murphy, D. D.  
 ✠ James Doyle, D. D.  
 ✠ P. M'Nicholas, D. D.  
 ✠ P. M'Gettigan, D. D.  
 ✠ Edmund French, D. D.  
 ✠ Thomas Coen, D. D.  
 ✠ Robert Logan, D. D.  
 ✠ Patrick Burke, D. D.  
 ✠ John Ryan, D. D.



Now you see, brethren, the signatures of all these Doctors of Divinity, these Roman Bishops, to this Address and Declaration, which to give it more weight and authority, they address to their Priests and people.

You have here only the first and last paragraphs of it, which express their intention in its publication, as if being addressed to their Priests and people, it furnished a conclusive pledge and proof that they could never teach them any other principles than those contained in this declaration. Now mark, brethren, one of the principles which in the eleventh head they abjure on their oath.

## XI.

“THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND NOT ONLY  
“DO NOT BELIEVE, BUT THEY DECLARE  
“UPON OATH, THAT THEY DETEST AS UN-  
“CHRISTIAN AND IMPIOUS THE BELIEF  
“THAT IT IS LAWFUL TO *MURDER OR DES-*  
“*TROY* ANY PERSON OR PERSONS WHAT-  
“SOEVER, FOR OR UNDER THE PRETENCE  
“OF THEIR BEING *HERETICS*, AND ALSO  
“THE PRINCIPLE THAT NO FAITH IS TO BE  
“KEPT WITH HERETICS.”

“*The Pastoral address and declaration of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland,*” published as an appendix to Dr. Doyle’s, “*Essay on the Catholic claims, addressed to the Earl of Liverpool.*” Coyne, Dublin; and Booker, Bond Street.

Let every honest man in England, of whatever denomination he be, Protestant of the Established Church, Dissenter, Roman Catholic, or any man that values the common principles of truth, of oaths, of any moral obligation, let him look at these facts. These Bishops join together when it is their interest to deceive the Protestants of the empire, and

they declare upon their *oath*, "THAT THEY DETEST AS UNCHRISTIAN AND IMPIOUS," those *very principles* which we now prove as clearly as the light they had before published as Bishops, or when published received as Priests, as the standard exposition of the principles of their Church, and which they have since that oath, again set up as the *guide* of their Priests and their people. Nay, to gain the more credit they made this declaration and this oath in an address to those very Priests who must have been conscious of its falsehood, because these very Priests were taught by these very Bishops, to exercise themselves in these very principles which had been thus solemnly and awfully abjured. If these facts do not open the public eyes to Popery, then all that can be said is;—it is to be feared that God has given the nation up to the infatuation of a deep judicial blindness from which they shall only be awakened by the visitation of judgments that they have despised, and warnings that they have disregarded. Remember, brethren, we have not shrunk from the light of day—we bring no dark or secret charges—we have produced our documents before the face of the Empire, and founded on them, charges that defy refutation. May God in his mercy, enlighten the eyes and deliver the souls of the clergy and laity of the Church of Rome from a system by which they must stand condemned in the secret of their own consciences, at the tribunal of public judgment, and alas! how much more awfully before the bar of the holy God.

I remain, Protestant Brethren,

And Roman Catholic Countrymen,

Your Friend and Servant in the Truth,

R. J. M'GHEE.

London, June 12th, 1835.



